

### REMARKS

The applicant's remarks, below, are preceded by quotations of related comments of the examiner in small, boldface type.

**The applicant argues that since the Staerzl reference is more "involved" than the present invention, then it does not read on the claims as presented. The examiner disagrees as a closer reading of Staerzl describes, in column 3 lines 12-36, the complete operation of the device. It states that when adequate oil is flowing in the system, the temperature at the downstream sensor will be greater than the temperature at the upstream sensor and the resistance should be less at the downstream sensor than the upstream sensor. If the oil has stopped, however, the resistance will be approximately equal. The circuit then compares the resistance of the two sensors to determine adequate flow. With this in mind, then the temperature/resistance for upstream sensor [sic] would serve as the threshold by which the downstream sensor is compared, and thus would still disclose a sensing circuit comprising elements [sic] connected to determine [sic] a change in voltage across the thermistor, and compare [sic] that change to a threshold. The examiner feels the rejection is therefore valid.**

The applicant disagrees. In the applicant's claim 12, a "change in a voltage across the thermistor" is determined. Then the change in voltage is "compare[d] to a threshold." Neither of these steps is disclosed or suggested in Staerzl. To the contrary, Staerzl apparently only takes individual measurements of each of his sensors and never determines a change in the reading of either of his sensors. And, so, of course, he does not compare any change in sensor reading to a threshold. Thus, even if one were to construe the reading of the upstream sensor as a threshold (a notion that the applicant does not concede), the invention of claim 1 was not disclosed in or made obvious by Staerzl.

All of the dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claim on which they depend.

The fact that the applicant has responded to certain positions taken by the examiner does not mean that the applicant concedes any other positions of the examiner. The fact that the applicant has stated certain reasons for patentability of the claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims or other claims.